

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested additional information regarding a statement made in an Information Disclosure Statement filed previously for this case. Applicants provide the following information in response to the Examiner's request.

The Examiner's request for information was as follows:

"based on the claim made by the Applicant that even though the previously cited reference JP S63-215987 did not disclose the presence of a film extending at least part of the way between the scintillating columns this feature was in fact included in the product that was made based on this disclosure and the product was sold in the U.S. as early as 1990, which, if documented, would constitute prior art against the claims as presented in this Application, the Examiner requests any written documentation, such as, presentations, brochure, product description, or any similar written description where this feature of the product is in fact disclosed."

Applicants would first of all like to correct what may be a misunderstanding in the above-quoted statement by the Examiner. Specifically, at page 2 of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 1, 2004, Applicants made reference to two different types of sales information:

(1) Applicants first of all pointed out that, to the best of Applicants' knowledge, Applicants believed that the structure disclosed in JP S63-215987 was sold in the U.S. at least as early as 1990, except that the film of the structure apparently extended at least part of the way between the scintillator columns. In other words, it was believed that as early as 1990, a device including a fiber plate, with CsI columns formed thereon, and film formed over, and extending at least part of the way between, the CsI columns, was on sale in the United States.

(2) Applicants secondly pointed out that other different subject matter, in which the CsI scintillator columns and covering film were formed over an image sensor, rather than just a fiber plate, and again with the film formed over, and extending at least part of the way between the CsI columns, was on sale in the U.S. but not before February 14, 1997.

In other words, the subject matter in item (1) believed to be on sale in the U.S. at least as early as 1990 refers to a device including a fiber plate, with CsI columns formed thereon, and film formed over, and extending at least part of the way between, the CsI columns. The subject matter (2) believed to be on sale in the U.S. but not before February 14, 1997, on the other hand, refers to a device in which the CsI scintillator columns and covering film were formed over an image sensor, rather than just a fiber plate, and again with the film formed over, and extending at least part of the way between the CsI columns. To the extent the statements by the Examiner in the pending Office Action reflect an understanding otherwise, then Applicants respectfully submit that such statements are incorrect for the reasons indicated above.

As to the Examiner's request, Applicants advise that the requested documentation showing a device in which the CsI scintillator columns and covering film were formed over an image sensor rather than just a fiber plate, and again with the film formed over, and extending at least part of the way between the CsI columns, is not currently in the Applicants' possession. In an attempt to comply as fully as possible with the Examiner's request, the instant Response is accompanied by a document dated October 1998 showing model nos. J6671, J6673, J6675, J6677, and J6679 each having a CsI- based scintillator structure. If the undersigned is provided

with information falling more clearly within the category of information requested by the Examiner, the undersigned will endeavor to bring the same to Examiner's attention as promptly as possible.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the provided information and then pass this application into allowance. A favorable action is awaited.

### **CONCLUSION**

**Except** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

*Paul A. Fournier*  
Paul A. Fournier, Reg. No. 41,023

Dated: February 17, 2005

*for* John G. Smith  
Registration No. 33,818

**Customer No. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 739-3000 (Telephone)  
(202) 739-3001 (Facsimile)